

Appl. No. 09/922,141
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of May 7, 2004

Page 7 of 11

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 2-15 are pending, with claim 15 being the independent claim.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication of allowability of the subject matter of claim 13. While this claim remains in dependent format, Applicant will consider providing the subject matter of claim 13 in independent form in a subsequent reply.

Fee Calculation

The Office Action requires payment for claim 14, asserting that this claim is an independent claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees. As set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.75(c): *"One or more claims may be presented in dependent form, referring back to and further limiting another claim or claims in the same application..."* Claim 14 refers back to claim 15, and thus is in dependent form.

Objections to the Drawings

The Office Action objects to the drawings under 37 C.F.R § 1.83(c) as not including each and every feature of claims 12 and 13. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection to the drawings. The filed Fig. includes, inter alia, an adapter circuit (10). This adapter circuit includes, inter alia, two npn transistors and six pnp transistors. Claim 12 relates to a plurality of the adaptors 10 and thus a drawing to that effect would include a duplication at least once of the adaptor 10. Claim 13 merely states the multitude of transistors of the plurality of adaptors 10. Clearly, from the number of pnp and npn transistors, eight and 24, respectively, claim 13 includes four of the adaptors 10. It is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art, having had the benefit of the filed application, would readily realize the multiple

Atty. Docket No. DE000111

Appl. No. 09/922,141
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of May 7, 2004

Page 8 of 11

adaptors of claim 12 and the required elements of the multiple adaptors of claim 13. As such, it is respectfully submitted that requiring additional drawings showing duplicate adaptors and elements thereof would be superfluous. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this objection to the drawings is improper and should be withdrawn.

Objections to the Specification

Applicant includes a new abstract.

Applicant(s) thank(s) the Examiner for providing information about recommended section headings. However, applicants respectfully decline to add the headings. Section headings are not statutorily required for filing a non-provisional patent application under 35 USC 111(a), but per 37 CFR 1.51(d) are only guidelines that are suggested for applicant's use. (See Miscellaneous Changes in Patent Practice, Response to comments 17 and 18 (Official Gazette, August 13, 1996) [Docket No: 950620162-6014-02] RIN 0651-AA75 ("Section 1.77 is permissive rather than mandatory. ... [T]he Office will not require any application to comply with the format set forth in 1.77").

Objections to the Claims

Claim 11 is objected to for not being in English. Applicants respectfully disagree. The claim does include reference to the basis of the acronym SCART in French. However, the fact that this is not in English does not cast ambiguity on the claim. Rather, the claim states clearly the type of output, a SCART output, which is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art. As such, it is respectfully submitted that this objection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office rejects claims 1, 3-6 12 and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Scheraga*. (US 5,789,955). For at least the reasons that

Atty. Docket No. DE000111

Appl. No. 09/922,141
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of May 7, 2004

Page 10 of 11

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103

The Office rejects claims 2, 7 and 9-11 as being obvious in view of *Schleraga*.

The claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) depend directly or indirectly from an independent claim. As such, and without conceding to the propriety of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 or the propriety of the combination of applied references, these claims are allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that all objections and rejections of record be withdrawn, that all pending claims be allowed, and that the application be passed to issue.

Except as otherwise stated in the above noted Remarks, Applicant notes that each of the amendments have been made to place the claims in better form for U.S. practice, not to distinguish the claims from prior art references, otherwise narrow the scope of previously pending claims or comply with other statutory requirements.

If any points remain in issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Petition is hereby made for a two-month extension of time as provided by 37 C.F.R. §1.136. Permission is hereby given to charge the fee required under 37 C.F.R. §1.17 to Deposit Account Number 50-0238. If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 50-0238 for any required fees, including but not limited to those fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17.

Atty. Docket No. DE000111

Appl. No. 09/922,141
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of May 7, 2004

Page 9 of 11

follow, claim 15 and the claims that depend therefrom are patentable over the applied art.

To properly establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, *all* of the claims elements must be found in the prior art. It follows, therefore, that if a *single* claimed element is not found in the prior art, a *prima facie* case of anticipation cannot be properly established. It is respectfully submitted that the reference to *Scherega* lacks at least one element of claim 15.

Claim 15 is drawn to a circuit arrangement having an adaptor. The adaptor features:

*"...at least one npn transistor current mirror (14); and
at least one pnp transistor current mirror (16) arranged in series with
the npn transistor current mirror (14); and connected to at least one high voltage
source (30), wherein the at least one pnp transistor current mirror amplifies the
input signal received from the at least one npn transistor current mirror."*

It is respectfully submitted that the reference to *Scherega* lacks at least the features of claim 15 recited above. To this end, the reference to *Scherega* is drawn to a current slew rate limiter, which limits the rate of increase of current supplied to a circuit node. This is wholly different than the circuit arrangement of claim 15. For example, the reference to *Scherega* does not disclose the used of a pnp transistor current mirror to amplify an input signal from an npn transistor current mirror. Rather, in *Scherega* the output 10 from the npn current mirror is input to the pnp current mirror. However, the reference does not disclose its amplification at the pnp current mirror. The amplification is exacted at the npn transistor N1. (Kindly refer to column 2, line 54 through column 4, line 35; and column 1, lines 43-59 for support for the above assertions.)

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 and the claims that depend therefrom are allowable over the applied art. Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Atty. Docket No. DE000111

Appl. No. 09/922,141
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of May 7, 2004

Page 11 of 11

Respectfully submitted on behalf of
Philips Electronics N.A., Corp.



by: William S. Francos, Esq.
(Reg. No. 38,456)

November 8, 2004
Volentine Francos & Whitt, PLLC
11951 Freedom Blvd.
One Freedom Square
Reston, VA 20190
(703) 715-0870
(610) 375-3513 (Mr. Francos' direct
line in Pennsylvania).

Atty. Docket No. DE000111